Mr. Handalasada Subbanna of Tirthahalli, *per contra*, advocated the retention of halat which only indirectly affected the producer and the reduction of the land assessment which directly pressed heavily on him.

Reply of Government.—As there are divergent opinions on this important question, a Committee consisting of the Councillors and of Colonel Grant, Mr. Madhava Rao, the Deputy Commissioners of Shimoga, Kadur and Tumkur, and the Representative Members interested in the subject should meet at the Public Offices and discuss the question in all its aspects.

NOTE.—The Committee composed as above accordingly met at the Public Offices on the 4th October and came to the conclusion that the matter should be left in the hands of the Government; that a tree-tax levied under a system of periodical re-count of trees was undesirable; that in the event of such a tax being imposed, it should be limited to bearing trees alone, and that a distinction should be made between the Malnad, which contributed the bulk of the sayer revenue, and the Maidan from which the revenue from this source was very small.

The proceedings of the Committee are embodied in Appendix A.

Subject No. 15.

Remission of Khalsat on Temple Inams.

Summary of discussion.—The Khalsat on Temple Inams may be remitted.

Several members joined in the discussion and represented that the lands endowed for the benefit of Temples were mostly in the possession of raiyats, from whom they could not be easily recovered, and that the rent paid by them was so small that, if full assessment were levied on excess areas, there would be nothing left to maintain the temples with.

Reply of Government.—There seems to be some foundation for the complaint as the temples interested do not generally appeal to the Government. Pending further orders on report from the Muzrai Department, coercive measures will not be resorted to for the collection of assessment on excess in such Temple Inams.

Subject No. 16.

Remission of Khalsat on Minor Personal Inams.

Summary of discussion.—The excess in Minor Personal Inams should not be assessed in cases in which clearly defined boundaries leave no room for encroachment, as well as in cases of open and undisturbed enjoyment for 50 years and upwards. Rule XII A of the Inam Rules supports this contention.

Reply of Government.—The case of Personal Inams is different from that of Temple Inams. The aggrieved parties in the former can appeal against the settlement, and on such appeal, a full enquiry will be made and the matter disposed of on its merits.